



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/784,591

02/23/2004

Charles Black

YOR920010225US2

9561

47939 7590 10/01/2010  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
(FOR IBM YORKTOWN)  
P.O. BOX 2207  
WILMINGTON, DE 19899-2207

EXAMINER

GOODWIN, DAVID J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2818

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/01/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/784,591	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BLACK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DAVID GOODWIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2818	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 September 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20,24,35,37,50,51,54 and 55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20,24,35,37,50,51,54 and 55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The affidavit filed on 9/22/10 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Leung (US 20020137260) reference.
2. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish applicant's alleged actual reduction to practice of the invention in this country or a NAFTA or WTO member country after the effective date of the Leung (US 20020137260) reference.
3. The evidence provided in the affidavit dated 9/22/10 is sufficient to support the applicant's conception of some of the inventive concept of the device. However, the proposal of a technique does not prove that the inventor has practiced the technique and thereby reduced the invention to practice.
4. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish diligence from a date prior to the date of reduction to practice of the Leung (US 20020137260) reference to either a constructive reduction to practice or an actual reduction to practice. The gap of 19 months between the conception of the invention, as supported by the evidence provided, and the constructive reduction to practice is significant enough to raise the issue of diligence in reduction to practice.
5. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Leung (US 20020137260) reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and

Art Unit: 2818

their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897).

6. The evidence provided does not support the applicant's having conceived of the limitations of the claims. The evidence submitted does not teach or indicate: that the applicant conceived of a particle size distribution of less than 50%, 10% or 5%, that the particle sizes are in a range of 2nm to 20nm, that the percentage of the thin film comprising nanoparticles in the range of 50% to 100%, the chemical composition of the organic surfactant, or the chemical composition of the solvent.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 20, 24, 35, 37, 50, 51, 53, 54, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung (US 2002/0137260) in view of Matijevic (US 5,900,223).

2. Regarding claim 37

3. Leung teaches a dielectric layer. Said dielectric layer consists of nanoparticles have a 2nm diameter and having a monodisperse size distribution, which is less than 5% standard deviation (paragraph 0021). The nanoparticles may be coated with a surfactant (paragraph 0021).

4. Leung does not teach the dielectric constant of the material.

Art Unit: 2818

5. Matijevic teaches barium titanate nanoparticles (column 12 lines 30-45). Barium titanate has a dielectric constant higher than 10.

6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use barium titanate nanoparticles in order to make advanced and superior products which have nanoparticles having good sinterability, dense packing, fine grained structure, and a high dielectric constant further the powders have great usefulness in many applications including dielectrics..

7. Note that a “product by process” claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made. See *In re Thorpe et al.*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC, 1985) and related case law cited therein which make it clear that it is the final product per se which must be determined in a “product by process” claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that, as here, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. As stated in *Thorpe*,

a. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patenability is based on the product itself. *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972); *In re Pilkington*. 411 F2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147, (CCPA 1969); *Buono v. Yankee Maid Dress Corp.*, 77 F.2d 274, 279, 26 USPQ 57, 61 (2d. Cir 1935).

Note that Applicant bears the burden of proof in such cases as the above case law makes clear.

8. Regarding claim 50.

Art Unit: 2818

9. Differences in percentages will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such percentages are critical. "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454,456,105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Since the applicant has not established the criticality (see next paragraph) of the percentages, and this percentages has been used in similar devices in the art (see, e.g., Matijavic column 7 lines 40-50) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use these values in the device.

#### CRITICALITY

The specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed thickness or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

10. Regarding claim 51.

11. Differences in percentages will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such percentages are critical. "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454,456,105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Since the applicant has not established the criticality (see next paragraph) of the percentages, and this percentages has been used in similar devices in the art (see, e.g., Matijavic column 7 lines 40-50) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use these values in the device.

Art Unit: 2818

### CRITICALITY

The specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed thickness or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

12. Regarding claim 20.

13. Differences in percentages will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such percentages are critical. "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454,456,105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Since the applicant has not established the criticality (see next paragraph) of the percentages, and this percentages has been used in similar devices in the art (see, e.g., Matijavic column 7 lines 40-50) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use these values in the device.

14. Regarding claim 35

15. Differences in percentages will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such percentages are critical. "Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the workable ranges by routine experimentation". *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454,456,105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Since the applicant has not established the criticality (see next paragraph) of the percentages, and this percentages has been used in similar devices in the art (see, e.g.,

Matijavic column 7 lines 40-50) it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use these values in the device.

#### CRITICALITY

16. The specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed thickness or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen dimensions or upon another variable recited in a claim, the applicant must show that the chosen dimensions are critical. *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

17. Regarding claim 53.

18. Leung teaches that the surfactant is not added (paragraph 0021).

19. Regarding claim 54.

1. In an embodiment where the functional groups are removed from the surface of the nanoparticle note that a “product by process” claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made. See *In re Thorpe et al.*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC, 1985) and related case law cited therein which make it clear that it is the final product per se which must be determined in a “product by process” claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that, as here, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. As stated in *Thorpe*,

a. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972); *In re Pilkington*. 411 F2d

Art Unit: 2818

1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147, (CCPA 1969); *Buono v. Yankee Maid Dress Corp.*, 77 F.2d 274, 279, 26 USPQ 57, 61 (2d. Cir 1935).

20. Note that Applicant bears the burden of proof in such cases as the above case law makes clear.

21. Regarding claim 55.

22. Leung teaches that the solvent is removed (paragraph 0023).

2. Note that a “product by process” claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made. See *In re Thorpe et al.*, 227 USPQ 964 (CAFC, 1985) and related case law cited therein which make it clear that it is the final product per se which must be determined in a “product by process” claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that, as here, an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in “product by process” claims or not. As stated in *Thorpe*,

b. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972); *In re Pilkington*. 411 F.2d 1345, 1348, 162 USPQ 145, 147, (CCPA 1969); *Buono v. Yankee Maid Dress Corp.*, 77 F.2d 274, 279, 26 USPQ 57, 61 (2d. Cir 1935).

Note that Applicant bears the burden of proof in such cases as the above case law makes clear.

23. Regarding claim 24

24. Matijev teaches that the particles are barium titanate.

Art Unit: 2818

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use barium titanate nanoparticles in order to make advanced superior products which have nanoparticles having good sinterability, dense packing, fine grained structure, and a high dielectric constant.

26. Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leung (US 2002/0137260) in view of Matijev (US 5,900,223) as applied to claim 37 and further in view of Yokouchi (US 5,143,637).

27. Regarding claim 54

28. Leung in view of Matijev teaches elements of the claimed invention above.

29. Leung in view of Matijev does not teach the composition of the surfactant.

30. Yokouchi teaches a particle surfactant comprising a carboxyl group (column 5 lines 25-35).

31. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to coat the particles with carboxyl groups in order to increase the dispersion of the particles.

### ***Response to Arguments***

32. Applicant's arguments filed 9/22/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

33. The applicant argues that the affidavit and supporting evidence is sufficient to overcome the Lung reference.

34. The affidavit and supporting evidence does not support that the applicant conceived of the invention, was diligent in reducing the invention to practice, or reduced the invention to practice prior to the effective date of the Leung reference. Therefore

the affidavit does not overcome the Leung reference and the Leung reference is applied above.

***Conclusion***

35. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID GOODWIN whose telephone number is (571)272-8451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00am through 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Loke can be reached on (571)272-1657. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2818

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Djg

/STEVEN LOKE/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2818